

EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

-- --

IN RE: BARD IVC FILTERS :
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION : No. MD-15-02641-PHX-DGC
: :

-- --
OCTOBER 11, 2016
-- --

DO NOT DISCLOSE - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW

Videotaped deposition of CHRISTOPHER
D. GANSER, held at HILTON SHORT HILLS,
41 John F. Kennedy Parkway, Short Hills, New
Jersey, commencing at 9:32 a.m., before
Margaret M. Reihl, a Registered Professional
Reporter, Certified Realtime Reporter, and
Notary Public.

GOLKOW TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
deps@golkow.com

1 Q. Have you ever read it?

2 A. No.

3 Q. Do you know you're featured throughout
4 the report?

5 MS. DALY: Object to the form.

6 BY MR. LOPEZ:

7 Q. No, I mean your name is in the report.
8 Wouldn't you want to see what Dr. Kessler, a
9 plaintiff's expert said about, you know, some of the
10 documents that you may have created or weighed in on?

11 MS. DALY: Object to the form.

12 THE WITNESS: I'm sure I will be
13 presented with certain documents from that
14 report with my name on it.

15 BY MR. LOPEZ:

16 Q. Okay. And you haven't seen any part of
17 the report?

18 A. I have not seen any part of the report.

19 Q. Sir, do you agree that when a device is
20 cleared to be marketed through the 510(k) process that
21 this does not reflect a determination by the FDA that
22 the device is safe and effective?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. That a determination of substantial

1 equivalence is not equivalent to an approval by the FDA
2 of the device's safety and effectiveness; you agree
3 with that?

4 A. Could you repeat the question.

5 Q. Do you agree that a determination of
6 substantial equivalence is not equivalent to an
7 approval by the FDA of the device's safety and
8 effectiveness?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And would you also agree that
11 substantial equivalence determination does not in any
12 way denote official approval of the device and that any
13 representation conveying an impression of official
14 approval is misleading and constitutes misbranding?

15 MS. DALY: Object to the form, lack of
16 foundation.

17 THE WITNESS: I would agree.

18 BY MR. LOPEZ:

19 Q. Okay. The next document, we talked
20 about guidance documents and how part of your job was
21 to be familiar with certain guidance documents as they
22 related to devices.

23 Do you recall that?

24 A. Yes.